

REMARKS

The Applicant hereby traverses the current objections and rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of such in light of the remarks contained herein. Claims 7-11 have been allowed and claims 2, 3, 6 and 14-18 are indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1-12 and 13-20 remain pending in this application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 12, 13, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,768,380 to Hong et al (hereinafter “Hong”).

“Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 12, as amended, recites “wherein said coupling includes inductive coupling.” In the Current Action the Examiner points to Hong, at fig. 5, to satisfy this limitation. (see Current Action, pg. 2). However, at fig. 5, Hong does not teach or suggest inductive coupling as required by claim 12. Rather, Hong merely describes transmission line 112 and transistors Q1, Q2, and Q3 as being between transmission lines 110 and 111. *see* Hong col. 5, lines 30-35. However, Hong is wholly silent as to “inductance.” Moreover, the Applicant believes such is not inherent within the disclosure of Hong as there is no reference as to a desirable coupling mechanism other than those explicitly shown in figure 5. As such, Hong fails to teach every limitation of the Applicant’s claimed invention. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of record.

Claims 13, 19, and 20 depend from claim 12 and thereby inherit the every limitation from claim 12. As shown above, the Examiner’s proposed combination fails to teach or suggest each recited limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 13, 19, and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,227,734 to Schindler et al (hereinafter “Schindler”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,653,905 to Ishibayashi (hereinafter “Ishibayashi”).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *see M.P.E.P. § 2143.* Without admitting that the first or second criteria is satisfied, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Schindler and Ishibayashi fails to satisfy the third criteria.

Claim 1 recites “a first auxiliary conductor inductively coupled to said primary conductor” and “first non-inverting amplification component with an input connected to said primary conductor and an output connected to said first auxiliary conductor.” In the Current Action, the Examiner attempts to satisfy these limitations by referring to Ishibayashi. Specifically, the Examiners opines “Ishibayashi discloses a circuit diagram comprising a transformer (T) having a first primary conductor coupled to the source of transistor (21); a first auxiliary conductor coupled to the drain of transistor (21).” (see Current Action, pg. 3). However, examination of Ishibayashi, at col. 2, lines 51-55, makes clear that Ishibayashi does not teach or suggest the recited limitations. Instead, Ishibayashi merely describes FETs having their sources connected in parallel to the end of the primary winding of the transformer T...and the FETs drains connected in parallel to the secondary winding of the transformer T. (Ishibayashi, col. 2, lines 51-53). As the Applicant best understands, only the windings of transformer T are inductively coupled. However, the transformer windings are not the same as a first auxiliary conductor coupled to a primary conductor. That is, the parallel arrangement of both the sources and drains of the FET’s (designated by the Examiner as being the primary conductor and auxiliary conductor) are not the windings of the transformer. As such, Ishibayashi fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations. Schindler

is not relied upon to teach or suggest the missing limitations. Therefore, the Examiner's proposed combination fails to comport with 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of record.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and thereby inherit the every limitation from claim 1. As shown above, the Examiner's proposed combination fails to teach or suggest each recited limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 2, 3, 6, 7-11, and 14-18 include allowable subject matter. In view of the remarks above, the Applicant submits that that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1078, under Order No. 10030059-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV482724066US in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: December 6, 2005

Typed Name: Laura Horton

Signature: Laura Horton

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael A. Papalas

Reg. No.: 40,381

Date: December 6, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8186